PTO/SB/21 (09-04)

PTO/SB/21 (09-04)
Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. **Application Number** 09/756,477 Filing Date TRANSMITTAL 01/08/2001 First Named Inventor **FORM** DAVID E. FORD, ET AL. Art Unit 1711 Examiner Name U.K. RAJGURU (to be used for all correspondence after initial filing) Attorney Docket Number 6240.880 Total Number of Pages in This Submission **ENCLOSURES** (Check all that apply) After Allowance Communication to TC ✓ Fee Transmittal Form Drawing(s) Appeal Communication to Board Licensing-related Papers of Appeals and Interferences Fee Attached Appeal Communication to TC Petition (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) Amendment/Reply Petition to Convert to a Proprietary Information Provisional Application After Final Power of Attorney, Revocation Status Letter Affidavits/declaration(s) Change of Correspondence Address Other Enclosure(s) (please Identify Terminal Disclaimer Extension of Time Request below): Request for Refund **Express Abandonment Request** CD, Number of CD(s) Information Disclosure Statement Landscape Table on CD Certified Copy of Priority Remarks Document(s) Reply to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application Reply to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53 SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT Firm Name Liniak, Berenato & White, LLC Signature Printed name Joseph W. Berenato, III Date Reg. No. 10/05/2004 30,546 **CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING** I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Date

sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on

the date shown below:

Typed or printed name

Signature

Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0551-0032
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

TRANSMITTAL for FY 2005

Effective 10/01/2004. Patent fees are subject to annual revision.

Applicant claims small entity status. See 37 CFR 1.27

TOTAL AMOUNT OF PAYMENT

Signature

| (\$) | 300. | 00 |
|-------|------|----|
| ι Ψ / | | • |

| Complete if Known | | | | | | | |
|----------------------|-----------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Application Number | 09/756,477 | | | | | | |
| Filing Date | 01/08/2001 | | | | | | |
| First Named Inventor | DAVID E. FORD, ET AL. | | | | | | |
| Examiner Name | U.K. RAJGURU | | | | | | |
| Art Unit | 1711 | | | | | | |
| Attorney Docket No. | 6240.880 | | | | | | |

Date

10/05/2004

| METHOD OF PAYMENT (check all that apply) | | | FEE CALCULATION (continued) | | | | | |
|---|------------------------|--------------|--|---------------------------|-------------|--|----------|--|
| ✓ Check Credit card Money Other None | | | 3. ADDITIONAL FEES | | | | | |
| Order U | | Large I | Entity | Small | Entity | | | |
| Denosit | | Fee Code | Fee . (\$) | Fee Code | Fee (\$) | Fee Description | Fee Boid | |
| Account Number | | 1051 | 130 | 2051 | | Surcharge - late filing fee or oath | Fee Paid | |
| Deposit LINIAK DEDENATO 8 | WHITE | 1052 | 50 | 2052 | | Surcharge - late provisional filing fee or | | |
| Account Name | VVIII E, | 4050 | 400 | 4050 | 400 | cover sheet | | |
| The Director is authorized to: (check all that apply) | | 1053 1812 | 130 2 520 | 1053 1812 | | Non-English specification For filing a request for ex parte reexamination | | |
| ☐ Charge fee(s) indicated below | | 1804 | 920* | 1804 | _, | Requesting publication of SIR prior to | | |
| ✓ Charge any additional fee(s) or any underpayment of fee(s) | | | | | | Examiner action | | |
| Charge fee(s) indicated below, except for the filing fee | | 1805 | 1,840* | 1805 | 1,840* | Requesting publication of SIR after Examiner action | | |
| to the above-identified deposit account. | | 1251 | 110 | 2251 | 55 | Extension for reply within first month | | |
| FEE CALCULATION 1. BASIC FILING FEE | | 1252 | 430 | 2252 | 215 | Extension for reply within second month | | |
| Large Entity Small Entity | | 1253 | 980 | 2253 | 490 | Extension for reply within third month | | |
| Fee Fee Fee Fee Fee Description Code (\$) Code (\$) | Fee Paid | 1254 | 1,530 | 2254 | 765 | Extension for reply within fourth month | | |
| 1001 790 2001 395 Utility filing fee | | 1255 | 2,080 | 2255 | 1,040 | Extension for reply within fifth month | | |
| 1002 350 2002 175 Design filing fee | | 1401 | 340 | 2401 | 170 | Notice of Appeal | | |
| 1003 550 2003 275 Plant filing fee | | 1402 | 340 | 2402 | 170 | Filing a brief in support of an appeal | | |
| 1004 790 2004 395 Reissue filing fee | | 1403 | 300 | 2403 | 150 | Request for oral hearing | 300.00 | |
| 1005 160 2005 80 Provisional filing f | ee | 1451 | 1,510 | 1451 | 1,510 | Petition to institute a public use proceeding | | |
| SUBTOTAL (1) | (\$) | 1452 | 110 | 2452 | 55 | Petition to revive - unavoidable | | |
| | | 1453 | 1,330 | 2453 | 665 | Petition to revive - unintentional | | |
| | ee from | 1501 | 1,370 | 2501 | | Utility issue fee (or reissue) | | |
| | below Fee Paid | 1502 | 490 | 2502 | 245 | Design issue fee | | |
| Total Claims | | 1503 | 660 | 2503 | | Plant issue fee | | |
| Claims - 3 - 4 - 1 - 1 - 2 - 1 - 2 - 1 - 2 - 1 - 2 - 1 - 2 - 2 | | 1460 | 130 | 1460 | 130 | Petitions to the Commissioner | | |
| , · · · · · | | 1807 | 50 | 1807 | 7 50 | Processing fee under 37 CFR 1.17(q) | | |
| Large Entity Small Entity Fee Fee Fee Fee Fee Fee Fee Fee Fee Description | on | 1806 | 180 | 1806 | | Submission of Information Disclosure Stmt | | |
| Code (\$) | | 8021 | 40 | 8021 | 40 | Recording each patent assignment per property (times number of properties) | | |
| 1202 18 2202 9 Claims in excess | | 1809 | 790 | 2809 | 395 | Filing a submission after final rejection | | |
| | ms in excess of 3 | | | | | (37 CFR 1.129(a)) | | |
| 1203 300 2203 150 Multiple depende 1204 88 2204 44 ** Reissue indep | ent claim, if not paid | 1810 | 790 | 2810 | 395 | For each additional invention to be examined (37 CFR 1.129(b)) | | |
| over original pa | | 1801 | 790 | 2801 | 395 | Request for Continued Examination (RCE) | | |
| | s in excess of 20 | 1802 | 900 | 1802 | 900 | | | |
| and over original patent | | Other | of a design application | | | | | |
| SUBTOTAL (2) (\$) | | | Other fee (specify) *Reduced by Basic Filing Fee Paid SUBTOTAL (3) (\$) 300 00 | | | | | |
| For number previously paid, if greater, For Reissues, see above | | | | 300 TOTAL (3) (4) 3000.00 | | | | |
| SUBMITTED BY | /// | | onietro | tion No. | | (Complete (if applicable)) | | |
| Name (Print/Type) Joseph W. Berenat | a, III / I / | - 12 | eyisti di | don IVO. | 30. | 546 Telephone 301-896-0600 | | |

WARNING: Information on this form may become public. Credit card information should not be included on this form. Provide credit card information and authorization on PTO-2038.

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.17 and 1.27. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

PATENT UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of DAVID E. FORD, ET AL.

:

Serial No. 09/756,477

Art Unit: 1711

Filed: January 8, 2001

Examiner: Rajguru, U.K.

Title: THERMOPLASTIC DOOR SKINS

AND METHOD OF MANUFACTURE

THEREOF

Atty. Dkt.: 6240.880

APPELLANT'S REPLY BRIEF UNDER 37 CFR 1.193(b).

Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents Commissioner for Patents PO Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Technology Center 1700

Dear Sir:

Appellant requests that the following remarks be considered in reply to the Examiner's Answer of August 5, 2004 to Appellant's Appeal Brief submitted on April 14, 2004.

REMARKS

Grouping of Claims:

The Examiner asserts that all claims under appeal are directed to one invention, a molded door skin, and therefore stand or fall together. Appellant respectfully disagrees. While all of the claims are directed generally to a molded door skin, each claim defines a separate invention having distinct limitations that are patentably distinguishable from inventions set forth in other claims. As noted in Appellant's Brief, each claim must be considered separately given there may be several inventions disclosed in the application. Obviously, a broad category such as a door skin may include numerous patentably distinguishable inventions. Appellant has properly stated in its Brief that the claims do not stand or fall together, and presented arguments in support thereof pursuant to MPEP §1206. Therefore, the Examiner's position is without merit.

Reply to Arguments:

The Examiner's combination of the cited references is inappropriate. Sasaki et al. and Plummer et al. are neither in the field of Chen's endeavor nor reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the inventor was concerned. Sasaki et al. disclose molded articles used as automotive interior materials integrated with a skin material. Plummer et al. disclose composite thermoplastic materials used for making structural members. Such articles are not comparable to a molded door skin. Indeed, the Examiner acknowledges that these references are "not directed to the same invention as that of Chen".

However, the Examiner asserts that "Sasaki and Plummer offer useful suggestion/s to solve the particular problems faced by Chen." It is unclear what problems

Sasaki et al. and Plummer et al. address, particularly since neither of these references are directed to similar inventions to that of Chen. The advantages disclosed by Chen are disclosed in the '870 patent:

The advantages of this invention are as following: First, it provides structure for interlocking the top and sides of the skins together. Second, improve the strength of the frame less door, by adding increased thickness on the strips on the sides and top. Finally, door bottom uses preformed bottom insert 31 that increases moisture resistance and limits deformation. In addition, the door bottom can be trimmed with difficulty. A major advantage is using the interlocking ribs with grooves in the accessory block and hinge member that makes the door assembly functional without a significant internal structure.

See U.S. Patent No. 5,644,870, column 3, lines 44-54. Thus, Chen is not concerned with altering the composition of its door skins. More importantly, there is no suggestion or motivation for combining Chen with Sasaki et al. and/or Plummer et al. The Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

The Examiner also admits that the "prior art does not specifically and exactly teach the claimed amounts of claimed ingredients of the composition", but asserts that it "is well known in the art and also obvious to vary amount disclosed in the prior art to obtain end product/s with specific desired characteristics". First, Appellant is not simply claiming a composition, as discussed in the Appeal Brief. Second, there is no suggestion or motivation for modifying the compositions of Sasaki et al. or Plummer et al. Third, even if there were such a suggestion, which there is not, there is no suggestion or motivation for combining Sasaki et al. and Plummer et al. with Chen.

The combination of the cited references in a manner that reconstructs Appellant's invention only with the benefit of hindsight is insufficient to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

In light of the arguments set forth herein, as well as those submitted in the Appeal Brief, Appellant respectfully requests that the Board reverse the Examiner's Final rejection. Allowance of all pending claims is earnestly solicited.

Appellant submits herewith a Request for an Oral Hearing pursuant to 37 C.R.F. §1.194, along with the requisite fee. It is believed that no other fees are due with this submission. Should that determination be incorrect, then please debit Account No. 50-0548 and notify the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

William C. Schrot

Registration No. 48,447

Attorney for Appellant

Liniak, Berenato & White, LLC

6550 Rock Spring Drive, Suite 240 Bethesda, Maryland 20817

Telephone: (301) 896-0600 Facsimile: (301) 896-0607 Email: wschrot@lblw.com

4